

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action, Claims 16, 28, 41, and 43 were amended. Claims 27 and 42 were canceled. Claims 19, 20, 24-26, 29-40, and 44 remain unchanged. New claims 45 through 48 have been added.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Voluntary Claim Amendments

Applicant has voluntarily amended Claims 28 and 43 to revise dependencies due to the claims they dependent upon previously being canceled. No new matter is added with this amendment.

New Claims

Claims 45 through 48 have been newly added. Support for new claim 45 can be found at least in paragraphs [0024], [0035], [0036], and [0042] of the specification as filed. Support for new claims 46 and 47 can be found at least in paragraph [0029]) of the specification as filed. Support for new claim 48 can be found at least in paragraphs [0029], and [0034]) of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Rejection of Claim 41 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art:

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 41 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art as herein amended.

Independent Claim 41 has been amended to clarify applicant's invention as claimed. Specifically, Claim 41 has been amended to clarify that the mobile node, while "operating within the home network of the mobile node" creates "a binding list by determining the one or more correspondent nodes that have received a binding update corresponding to the mobile node." Thereafter, while "operating within a foreign network of the mobile node", the mobile node determines "the one or more correspondent nodes that have received a binding update corresponding to the mobile node, where the determination is made using the binding list entries created in the home network and prior to receiving any packets from the correspondent node" and sends "a binding update to the one or more correspondent nodes to inform the one or more correspondent nodes of a mobile new care-of address." (emphasis added) Support for these amendments can be found in paragraphs [0029] and [0045] of Applicant's original specification as filed; and therefore no new matter is added.

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's admitted prior art does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claim 41. For example, independent claim 41 as amended recites "operating within the home network of the mobile node including: creating a binding list by determining the one or more correspondent nodes that have received a binding update corresponding to the mobile node" which is not anticipated either expressly or inherently, in Applicant's admitted prior art. Further, independent Claim 41 as amended recites "operating within a foreign network of the mobile node including: determining the one or more correspondent nodes that have received a binding update corresponding to the mobile node, where the determination is made using the binding list entries created in the home network and prior to receiving any packets from the correspondent node." (emphasis added)

Applicant's admitted prior art only describes mobile IPv6 which "provides for a mobile node to move to different sites or networks without changing its IP address. A mobile node is always addressable by its "home" IP unicast address associated with a home site or network, regardless of the node's current point of attachment to the network infrastructure. The binding

updates referred to in Applicant's admitted prior art are sent only after receiving a message from a correspondent node via a home agent.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose each and every element of Claim 41. Applicant therefore submits that claim 41 is not anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art, and therefore the rejection of claim 41 under 35 USC 102(a) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claim 41 may now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 16, 19, 20, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341):

The rejection of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) is moot in view of the cancellation of Claim 27.

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 16, 19, 20, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) as herein amended.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to clarify Applicant's invention. Specifically, Independent claim 16 has been amended to recite "the mobile gateway router operates outside of a home network of the mobile node." Independent claim 16 has further been amended to recite "creating a new binding list entry identifying at least one correspondent node that has received a binding update corresponding to the mobile node while the mobile node is operating within its home mobile network. Independent claim 16 has been further amended to recite "sending a binding update to the one or more correspondent nodes of the binding list entry created in the home network identifying its attachment to the foreign network upon leaving the home network." Support for these amendments can be found at least in paragraphs [0029] and [0045] of Applicant's original specification as filed. Therefore, no new matter is added.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995), Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 16, as amended. For example, independent claim 16 recite(s) creating a binding list entry while operating in the home

mobile network and thereafter sending a binding update using the created binding list entry upon leaving the home network which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995), Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341).

Agarwal Col 3, Lines 55-60 specifically indicates that it is used in the context of a Foreign network ("..does not require presence of special agents in Foreign network. Location updates are directly transmitted from mobile nodes.."). Gwon simply reiterates the fact. It does not suggest creating a binding list in the home network, but simply states the fact that the first time a mobile leaves a network packets will reach the mobile node via the home agent. It does not suggest a solution.

As indicated in paragraph [008] of Applicant's specification as filed, the problem is in the context of mobile network, where though a mobile device may be in its home mobile network, the mobile router to which the mobile device is attached may be away from the mobile router's home. In this context as a mobile router may itself be sending a prefix based binding to selected correspondent nodes and the mobile node will become unreachable when it leaves the home mobile network. This is not a problem that any of the prior art even recognized to be able to suggest a solution for it. The solution as claimed in Claim 16 is to make the mobile device keep a binding list even when in its home network to track of those who have received a binding update corresponding to the mobile.

Since the combination of Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995), Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) fails to disclose Applicant's claimed invention as claimed in independent claim 16, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant requests that claim 16 now be passed to allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 19, 20, and 24-26 as herein amended. Claims 19, 20, and 24-26 contain further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claim 16. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19, 20, and 24-26 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 19, 20, and 24-26 may now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 28-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 28-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223) as herein amended.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 28-40 as herein amended. Claims 28-40 contain further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claim 16. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 28-40 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 28-40 may now be passed to allowance.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223) does not anticipate the further limitations of Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 28-40. Specifically, Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223) does not anticipate having a care of address in a home network. In Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Gwon (US 2003/0016655), Sorenson (US2002/0061009), and Lueng (US 6,959,341) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223), a mobile node sends a binding update with its CoA to a correspondent node and adds the CN to the binding list. By definition a CoA is a topologically correct address obtained by the mobile node in a foreign network. [See Column 3, lines 2-10 in Agarwal et al., for example] Note that the mobile node already has its home address which is the topologically correct address in its home subnet.

Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner that Malki, paragraph 32 is in the context of figure 3 which clearly shows the mobile away from its home network. Furthermore in paragraph 5, when describing the context, it states that a mobile obtains a CoA when it is in a foreign network. Both the LCoA and RCoA are in the context of a foreign network. Malki does not teach the concept of a mobile node maintaining a binding update list when it is in its home network. Applicant respectfully submits that it is non-intuitive for a mobile node to keep a binding list of the nodes when it is in its home network.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 28-40 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 30-40 may now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's prior art in view of Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995):

The rejection of Claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's prior art in view of Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) is moot in view of the cancellation of Claim 42.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 43 as herein amended. Claim 43 contains further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claim 41. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 43 is in proper condition for allowance and request that claim 43 may now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's prior art in view of Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) and further in view of Inoue et al (US 2002/0191576):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's prior art in view of Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) and further in view of Inoue et al (US 2002/0191576) as herein amended. Claim 44 contains further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claim 41. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 44 is in proper condition for allowance and request that claim 44 may now be passed to allowance.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

February 26, 2008

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01 – 3rd Floor
Schaumburg, Illinois 60196
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Randi L. Karpinia/

Randi L. Karpinia
Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 46,148

Tel: 954-723-6449

Fax: 847-576-3750

E-mail: docketing.schaumburg@motorola.com